UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,069	11/27/2000	Ari Becks	BP100710	7165

466 7590 11/14/2006

YOUNG & THOMPSON
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET
2ND FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER	
PIERRE, MYRIAM	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/701,069	BECKS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Myriam Pierre	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08/23/06*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-6 and 8-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-2, 4-6, 8-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 November 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see page 1 lines 8-16, filed 08/23/06, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-2, 4-6, 8-16 under Suzuki et al. (6,345,243) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Suzuki et al. (5,010,486).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the knowledge base" in page 3 lines 6; page 4 lines 16-17. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 8-9 incorporate the problems of claim 1 by dependency.

4. Claims 1 and 10 recites the limitation "i.e." and should read "wherein", such as "reading a model, wherein the equivalent segment...".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (5,010,486) in view of Horiguchi et al. (6,243,669).

As to claims 1, 10 and 16, Suzuki et al. teaches a method for machine translation of information given a character string in a first language into a character string in a second language (Fig. 3 and col. 4 lines 30-59), comprising the steps of:

storage in a knowledge database a first language character string (col. 5 lines 30-49;) model segments (table 2 col. 5 lines 29-49; and Fig. 5c) and storing second language (target language) model segments (and Fig. 5d) in logical connection (intermediate translation, col. 4 lines 30-59) with these, model segments (Fig. 5d element B_4) in the form of character strings in the second language (Fig. 5d element B_5),

identifying a structural segment (Fig. 5b-e) in the character string of said first language following a first rule (Fig. 4 element 52, syntactic analysis portion; col. 5 lines 19-24; syntactic analysis portion determines if character string (word) is an adjective, pronoun, or adverb);

comparing identified structural segment (tree structure of both languages) in the form of character strings in the first (source) language stored (Fig. 5_{c-d} and Fig. 11) according to a second rule (Fig. 4 element 53, language transfer portion; col. 5 lines 19-24; based on tree structure which is based on the words that are necessarily character strings),

striving to select one model segment on the basis of said comparison (col. 4 lines 21-55; the intermediate language is a machine language to generate the translation, but

will go through several steps which will be model segments based on the comparison (context generation, syntactic generation, and morphological generation)),

reading a model in the form of a character string in the second (target) language logically connected (intermediate translation, col. 4 lines 30-59), and

translating structural segment into translation segment in the form of a character string in the second (target) language on the basis of said equivalent segment and a third rule (generation portion, Fig. 4 element 54; generation portion is based on post-positioning of the word as auxiliary to the main word),

characterized in that the identification of an intermediate word and said first rule is essentially based on the identification of intermediate word (intermediate translation, col. 4 lines 30-59)

following a first rule, identifying a first structural segment in a first language character string (col. 4 lines 30-59);

when no model segment to be selected following the second rule is found as a result of the comparison of the structural segments (col. 9 lines 2-4; unregistered words),

i). the structural segment is displayed by means of a user interface to a user (col. 8 lines 49-56 and Fig. 7);

iii). storing the structural segment and the equivalent segment, input by the user, in the knowledge base for use as model segments in the knowledge base (Fig. 11 and col. 10 lines 10-20);

Suzuki et al. do not explicitly teach after the structural segment being displayed to the user, the user inputs, from the user interface, the translation of the displayed structural segment as the equivalent segment and one of said rules is updated on the basis of equivalent segment input by the user from the user interface.

However, Horiguchi et al. do teach after the structural segment being displayed to the user, the user inputs, from the user interface, the translation of the displayed structural segment as the equivalent segment and one of said rules is updated on the basis of equivalent segment input by the user from the user interface (col. 9 lines 18-24)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the data structure for translation knowledge of Horiguchi et al. into the language translation system of Suzuki et al., because Horiguchi et al. teach that this would provide added new words or names or expressions and their translations, col. 9 lines 18-24.

As to claim 10, Suzuki et al. teaches,

knowledge base means for storing model segments in the form of character strings in said first language, and in logical connection with these, equivalent segments in the form of character strings in the second language, and for storing a first, second, and third rule (col. 4 lines 30-59 and Fig. 11).

The rest of the limitations of claim 10 are rejected for the similar reasons in rejecting claim 1.

As to claims 2 and 11, which depends on claims 1 and 10, Suzuki et al. teaches

information to be given as a character string in the second language is generated basis of translation segments and a fourth rule (pivot method, col. 4 lines 55-59).

As to claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Suzuki et al. teaches

type identifier of the model segment is stored in logical connection with the model segment (Fig. 11 and col. 4 lines 30-59).

As to claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Suzuki et al. teaches,

there are two model segments representing different languages logically connected to each other (col. 4 lines 30-59).

As to claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Suzuki et al. teaches, characterized in that information is fed over the user interface to update the user knowledge base with a view to translate first information and said input data is used to update other date than those needed for the translation of the said first information in said knowledge base (col. 9 lines 3-15 and 40-53).

As to claim 9, which depends on claim 1, Suzuki et al. teaches,

characterized in that the method further comprises steps of:

reading the first information given as a character string in the first language (Fig. 5d);

translating the fist information given as a character string in said first language on the basis of data in the knowledge base into first information given as a character string in the second language to the extend allowed by the data available in the knowledge base (col. 4 lines 30-46);

determining the additional data (intermediate language) needed to complete the translation of the first information given as a character string in the first language into first information in the form of the character string in the second language (col. 4 lines 25-55);

feeding said additional data in the knowledge base to update the knowledge base (col. 10 lines 7-30);

completing the translation of the first information given as a character string in the first language into first information given as a character string in the second language (col. 10 lines 20-30),

storing said first information given in the second language (col. 10 lines 15-20);

reading the second information given as a character string in the first language (Fig. 3 element 6),

translating the second information given as character string in the first language into second information given as a character string in the second language on the basis of said update data in the knowledge base (Fig. 4 elements 51-54 and col. 4 lines 25-55).

As to claim 12, which depends on claim 10, Suzuki et al. teaches, user interface means for connecting the user to said knowledge base means (Fig. 1).

As to claim 13, which depends on claim 12, Suzuki et al. teaches characterized in that the user interface means (Fig. 1).

Suzuki et al. do not teach characterized in that the user interface means are connected to said knowledge base mans over a transmission network.

However, Horiguchi et al. do teach characterized in that the user interface means are connected to said knowledge base mans over a transmission network (col. 9 lines 18-24)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the data structure for translation knowledge of Horiguchi et al. into the language translation system of Suzuki et al., because Horiguchi et al. teach that this would provide added new words or names or expressions and their translations performed remotely at an internet server and transmitted using internet telephony, col. 9 lines 18-24.

As to claim 14, which depends on claim 10, Suzuki et al. teaches,

a first knowledge base and a second knowledge base so that specific users have access to first knowledge base means and only some of specific uses have access to second knowledge base means (col. 4 lines 25-55 and Table 1).

As to claim 15, which depends on claim 10, Suzuki et al. teaches,

a first knowledge base means and a second knowledge base means, selective transfer of data stored in said knowledge base to first knowledge base (col. 4 lines 25-55 and Table 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (6,345,243) in view of Horiguchi et al. (6,243,669), in further view of Zamora (4,965,763).

As to claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Suzuki et al. teaches structural segment (Tables 1-2, col. 4 and 5)

Suzuki et al. in view of Horiguchi et al. do not explicitly teach structural segment comprises of a punctuation mark.

However, Zamora do teach structural segment comprises of a punctuation mark (col. 12 lines 42-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the translation memory system of Suzuki et al. in

view of Horiguchi et al.'s into the information extraction that parses punctuation marks of Zamora, because Zamora teaches that this would want to identify automatically commonly specified information in free format to provide automatic indexing and indexing aid, Abstract.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Myriam Pierre whose telephone number is 571-272-7611. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Myriam Pierre
AU 2626

ABUL AZAD 11/13/06
PRIMARY EXAMINER